



**Fw: draft summary and next steps from Tuesday 2/7 mtg between EPA and Chesapeake**

**Jeanne Briskin** to: stephanie.timmermeyer

02/08/2012 01:49 PM

Cc: Ramona Trovato, John Satterfield, Fred Hauchman, Michael Overbay, David Jewett

Bcc: Jeanne Briskin

Hi Stephanie,

Thanks for sending the information regarding 3 candidate areas for a prospective case study. Dave Jewett, Mike Overbay, Doug Beak, as well as two of our hydrogeologists, Randall Ross and Steve Acree from our Ada lab, are looking forward to meeting with you and your folks tomorrow in Oklahoma City to make further progress.

Here is our summary of our meeting and follow up action items. Please feel free to add or revise items from your notes.

Meeting 2/7/12

Summary

1. EPA provided a copy of the Hydraulic Fracturing QMP, and explained that before the QMP was finalized, the overall ORD QMP and individual lab and center QMPs governed the work. The QMP provided has since been updated to reflect that Dave Jewett has replaced Bob Puls as the Technical Research Lead, and that Steve Watkins has replaced Steve Vandegrift as QA lead.
2. Chesapeake was interested in how EPA implements the glycol method at the Region 3 lab. Since the ORD Policy and Procedure Manual 13.4 covers how ORD laboratories operate, EPA provided eight documents that describe how EPA Region 3's lab operates, which is relevant regarding how they implement the glycol ether method. EPA also provided a page which describes how the glycol method is implemented in the Region 3 lab.
3. Chesapeake described three plays in Oklahoma and Texas (the Mississippi Limestone, the Colony Wash and the Eagleford) which have ~ 12 wells that may meet EPA's required site selection criteria. Chesapeake described the depth of treatable water and the typical depth of production wells in each area.
4. Chesapeake explained that they need 3 months between well pad construction and drilling. The parties identified the potential schedule savings if the QAPP can be completed more expeditiously than estimated in the schedule EPA provided earlier.
5. EPA explained the importance of locating monitoring wells to allow collection of baseline data and to allow groundwater flow from the production well to reach the monitoring well within the timeline of the study. Chesapeake stated that they have severe concerns about placing monitoring wells on the well pad. EPA described how it installs and abandons wells in a manner that should remove or significantly reduce these issues. The group discussed possible steps including moving the production well close (within 75') of the edge of the well pad, and conditions under which horizontal monitoring wells might be acceptable. Chesapeake would like EPA to provide information on how the well would be built, including a schematic and how the samples would be gathered.) Chesapeake stated that monitoring well placement decisions might require full site characterization. EPA noted that we would like to come to agreement about how to proceed promptly to allow the drilling and related activities as well as the study proceed in a timely manner in case the local situation requires sampling from close to the well bore.
6. Chesapeake stated that the study design and the development of QAPPs were up to EPA as it is EPA's study.

7. EPA stated that we want to work to make sure that the study does not slow down or interfere with Chesapeake's schedule or cause them to incur unnecessary cost.

Action items:

1. Chesapeake will send ATGAS data and reports to EPA.
2. EPA staff will meet with Chesapeake in Oklahoma City 2/9/12 to select new prospective case study location.
3. Chesapeake will send EPA latitude-longitude data on possible prospective case study locations and associated information about the plays. (completed 2/8)
4. Chesapeake will share its example QAPP with EPA.
5. EPA and Chesapeake will figure out what to say and when to inform Louisiana regarding the selection of a new case study location. The rationale is the incompatible scheduling needs for the case study and the spud date for the well.
6. Chesapeake will check with their lab to see if they need more information beyond what has been provided by EPA to allow the Chesapeake lab to conduct the glycol analyses.
7. Chesapeake will check to see if microseismic data is or will be available for the candidate prospective case study wells or available close nearby.
8. Chesapeake was interested in a reference for the definition of critical analytes. The reference is p. 30 of the EPA Hydraulic Fracturing QMP, dated October 18, 2011 and provided by EPA on 2/7. (completed 2/8)

Best,

Jeanne

Jeanne Briskin  
Office of Science Policy  
Office of Research and Development  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (8104R)  
Washington, D.C. 20460  
(202) 564-4583 - office  
(202) 565-2911 - fax  
briskin.jeanne@epa.gov

Address for Deliveries:  
US EPA  
Ronald Reagan Building --Room 51144  
Washington DC 20004